

Reviving Dormant Memories: Investigating Catastrophic Forgetting in Language Models through Rationale-Guidance Difficulty

Huashan Sun Yang Gao*

School of Computer Science and Technology, Beijing Institute of Technology
{hssun, gyang}@bit.edu.cn

Abstract

Although substantial efforts have been made to mitigate catastrophic forgetting in continual learning, the intrinsic mechanisms are not well understood. In this paper, we discover that when a forgetting model passively receives an externally provided partial appropriate rationale, its performance on the forgotten task can be restored. Furthermore, by simply adding a task-agnostic prefix to the original instruction, the forgetting model can actively generate an appropriate rationale to reach the correct answer. These findings suggest that the model does not actually “forget” the task knowledge; instead, the degraded performance can be attributed to the failure of the original instructions in guiding the model to generate the appropriate rationales. Based on this insight, we propose the Rationale-Guidance Difficulty metric to evaluate how effectively a given instruction guides the model in generating appropriate rationales. We apply this metric to optimize the allocation of replay data in replay-based continual learning algorithm. Experimental results demonstrate that our data allocation method effectively mitigates catastrophic forgetting and maintains better model plasticity simultaneously across models.

1 Introduction

While large language models (LLMs) acquire extensive knowledge during pre-training (Brown et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023a; Yang et al., 2023), in reality, both knowledge and data are dynamic, necessitating that models adapt to different tasks or domains continuously (Zheng et al., 2024). Accordingly, continual learning can assist models in acquiring new knowledge incrementally, thereby enhancing their capabilities over time. However, a key challenge models face during continual learning is “catastrophic forgetting,” which refers to the phenomenon where a model’s performance on old




Figure 1: Methodology used in our experiments. **1.** We leverage CoT to probe the parameterized knowledge embedded in the model explicitly. **2.** We evaluate the performance of a forgetting model under three situations: “instruction-only prompting,” “instruction-only prompting with externally provided rationale,” and “instruction-only prompting with a task-agnostic prefix.” **3.** We find that in the latter two situations, the model could actively generate appropriate rationale, recovering task performance. Thus, we conclude that the model does not truly forget the old knowledge; instead, the original instructions are insufficient in guiding the generation of appropriate rationale, resulting in “pseudo-forgetting.”

tasks declines after learning new tasks (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; Goodfellow et al., 2014).

Despite the numerous methods proposed to mitigate catastrophic forgetting (Wang et al., 2024, 2023a; Zhao et al., 2024) (discussed in Section 2.2), few studies have begun to investigate the intrinsic mechanisms underlying this phenomenon. Kotha et al. (2024) propose the “task inference” hypothesis, which suggests that fine-tuning a model changes which of its abilities it tends to use, rather than causing it to actually forget those abilities. However, this hypothesis has been primarily validated on synthetic datasets rather than directly on

* Corresponding author

natural language datasets and LLMs. Similarly, Jiang et al. (2024) investigate forgetting in LMs through the lenses of instruction-following and task-related knowledge, proposing that forgetting stems from a decline in instruction-following capabilities rather than an actual loss of task-related knowledge. However, the expression of “task-related knowledge” varies between probing and practical use, leaving the conclusion insufficiently clarified.

In this work, we hypothesize that the model does not truly forget task knowledge; rather, its performance degradation on previous tasks is primarily attributable to the original instructions’ inability to guide the generation of relevant knowledge. The first question that naturally arises for a forgetting model is: *How does the model perform when passively provided with appropriate knowledge, such as the rationale of the Chain of Thought (CoT)?* Specifically, for a forgetting model, we concatenate k part of the rationale (ground truth) to the original instruction (see Figure 3 where $k = 0.1$) and evaluate the model’s performance. Our findings reveal that for models of varying sizes, providing even a portion of the appropriate rationale as guidance allows the model’s performance to recover (shown in Figure 2). Moreover, as k increases, the model’s performance can recover to pre-forgetting levels. There are two potential explanations: (1) the instructions fail to guide the generation of the corresponding knowledge, or (2) the knowledge has truly been forgotten. To investigate the underlying reason further, we pose the second question: *Can we help the model to actively generate the appropriate knowledge by modifying its prompt?* To explore this, we add a Task-Agnostic Prefix (Ye et al., 2024) before the original instruction (see Figure 4) and assess the performance of the forgetting model. This approach ensures that knowledge is generated and expressed in a same manner before and after forgetting. The experimental results (shown in Figure 5) indicate that, across models of various scales, the task-agnostic prefix can facilitate the forgetting model in generating relevant knowledge, thereby partially restoring its performance on forgotten tasks. The above experiments provide direct evidence for our hypothesis regarding LLMs: the model’s forgetting primarily stems from the original instructions’ inability to facilitate appropriate rationales, rather than an actual loss of task-related knowledge.

Building on the above conclusion, we propose

the Rationale-Guidance Difficulty metric to evaluate how effectively a given instruction can guide a model in generating an appropriate rationale. Utilizing this metric, we dynamically allocate replay data for each previous task to optimize data utilization. Experiments conducted across various scales and datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We directly verify on LLMs that task-related knowledge, also expressed in the same format as in instruction-following scenarios, is not actually forgotten. Instead, the deterioration in model performance arises from the inability of the original task instructions to facilitate the generation of appropriate rationale (Section 3).
2. We propose the Rationale-Guidance Difficulty metric and implement it for data allocation within a replay-based framework (Section 4). Experiments validate the effectiveness of our approach in mitigating catastrophic forgetting in the model (Section 5).

2 Related Work

2.1 Mechanism of catastrophic forgetting

Catastrophic forgetting refers to the tendency of models to lose previously acquired knowledge when learning new tasks (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; Goodfellow et al., 2014), a challenge that has been widely studied with numerous attempts to mitigate it (Section 2.2). Nevertheless, a substantial gap persists in comprehending the internal mechanisms that lead to these knowledge losses. Kotha et al. (2024) hypothesize that fine-tuned models do not “forget” prior abilities but rather “suppress” them. They suggest that models first perform “task inference” before applying the relevant capability, and fine-tuning biases this inference towards tasks aligned with the fine-tuning distribution, thereby suppressing performance on other prior capabilities. Jiang et al. (2024) hypothesize that a model’s task ability comprises both understanding task-related knowledge and following instructions. Their experiments reveal that “forgetting” in models is primarily due to a decline in the ability to follow instructions, rather than a loss of knowledge.




Figure 2: Changes in the model’s task performance after forgetting when k parts of the appropriate rationale are provided. **1.** A forgetting model can regenerate “forgotten knowledge” and gradually recover its “pre-forgetting” task performance when passively guided with partial “appropriate rationale.” **2.** the degree of recovery of the “forgotten knowledge” is related to the task difficulty and the scale of the model

2.2 Traditional methods in continual learning

Continual Learning (CL) seeks to progressively acquire knowledge from a sequence of tasks while retaining what has been previously learned (Zheng et al., 2024). Numerous continual learning methods have been proposed to address catastrophic forgetting: (1) *Regularization-based* methods constrain the features learned from previous tasks (Zhang et al., 2023a; Huang et al., 2021) or penalize changes to weights critical for those tasks (Zhou and Cao, 2021; Aljundi et al., 2018), ensuring that new learning minimally interferes with prior knowledge thus maintaining performance on earlier tasks. For example, O-LoRA (Wang et al., 2023a) mitigates catastrophic forgetting by learning tasks in different (low-rank) vector subspaces (LoRA parameters) using an additional orthogonal parameter loss. (2) *Architecture-based* methods aim to reduce interference between new and prior tasks by either dynamically increasing the model’s capacity (Zhao et al., 2024) or isolating the existing weights (Hu et al., 2024). SAPT (Zhao et al., 2024) aligns parameter-efficient tuning blocks with selection modules via a shared attention mechanism, effectively tackling both catastrophic forgetting and knowledge transfer. (3) *Replay-based* methods retain a small subset of prior training examples or features and revisit them when a new task is intro-

duced (Wang et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2021). Rather than retaining the original data, PCLL (Zhao et al., 2022), LFPT5 (Qin and Joty, 2022) and SSR (Huang et al., 2024) generate pseudo data samples that mimic the old data, either by leveraging the model itself or through a separate generative model.

3 Impact of Appropriate Rationale on “Pseudo-Forgetting”

Recall our assumption is that the model does not truly forget; rather, after learning new tasks, the instructions for the old tasks fail to “guide” the model in generating an “appropriate reasoning process,” which ultimately manifests as apparent “forgetting” of the old tasks. Thus, we aim to investigate the following two questions:

1. **Q1:** How does a forgetting model perform when *passively* provided with externally supplied “appropriate rationale”?
2. **Q2:** Can changing the prompt method enable the model to generate the “appropriate rationale” *actively*?

```

<s>[INST] Task: What is the logical relationship (contradiction, entailment
or neutral) between the "sentence 1" and the "sentence 2"? Choose one from
the option.

OPTIONS:
- neutral
- entailment
- contradiction

sentence 1: Case Study Evaluations.
sentence 2: Case Study preparations.

Answer: [/INST] The sentence 1 'Case Study Evaluations' implies a

```

Figure 3: Prompt example with additional k part of “appropriate” rationale guidance ($k = 0.1$). The **black** parts are the original instruction; The **green** parts are the added part of the “appropriate rationale”, which does not contain information directly related to the answer.

3.1 Appropriate Rationale Meeting “Pseudo-Forgetting”

In this section, we address **Q1**. We selected the model from the final stage of sequential learning and chose the test set of tasks with a high forgetting rate for the experiment. To offer “appropriate knowledge” guidance, as shown in Figure 3, we append k part of the rationale directly after the original instruction. It is important to note that the added portion with small k does not directly provide task-specific or answer-relevant information but instead serves to guide the model in shaping the overall direction of its predictions. The detailed description of the experimental data and model is provided in Section 5.1.

Results and Analysis Results are presented in Figure 2.

Firstly, when a “forgotten” model passively receives partial guidance on “appropriate rationale,” it can regenerate the “forgotten knowledge” and gradually restore its “pre-forgetting” task performance. Specifically, across various “forgotten” tasks, performance improves with increasing k -values, suggesting that the model’s knowledge remains intact. The issue lies in the original instructions’ inability to elicit the appropriate reasoning processes. With some “appropriate guidance,” the model can access the relevant task knowledge and complete the task.

Secondly, the degree of recovery of the model’s “task memory” is related to the task difficulty and the scale of the model. For instance, in the CB task, Mistral-7B returns to its pre-forgetting performance level at $k = 0.2$, while the MNLI task requires $k = 0.4$ to achieve the same recovery level. Meanwhile, to restore the pre-

forgetting performance level for Qwen2-0.5B and Llama2-13B, values of $k = 0.6$ and $k = 0.1$ are required, respectively.

```

#Question#:
In this task, you are given a dialogue from a conversation between an agent
and a customer. Your task is to determine the speaker of the dialogue.
Answer with "agent" or "customer".
Input: I have successfully booked your ticket with flight-1017, have a safe
journey.
#Rationale#:
The input consists of a statement confirming a ticket booking and wishing
the customer a safe journey. This type of communication is typically made
by a service provider, indicating that the speaker is the "agent".
#Answer#:
Agent

#Question#:
[Question-2]
#Rationale#:
[Rationale-2]
#Answer#:
[Answer-2]
...

#Question#:
Task: What is the logical relationship (contradiction, entailment or neutral)
between the "sentence 1" and the "sentence 2"? Choose one from the option.

OPTIONS:
- neutral
- entailment
- contradiction

sentence 1: Case Study Evaluations.
sentence 2: Case Study preparations.
#Rationale#:
{rationale generated by model}
#Answer#:
{answer generated by model}

```

Figure 4: Prompt example with Task-Agnostic Prefix. Context template (purple) and task-independent demonstrations (green) act as the prefix to the original instruction (black), formatting the final prompt that guides the model in generating rationale and answer using parameterized task knowledge.

3.2 Reviving Dormant Knowledge via Task-Agnostic Prefix Prompting

In the experiment in Section 3.1, the model passively received some “appropriate rationale” as guidance, allowing it to recover its performance gradually. To further verify and demonstrate our hypothesis, we address **Q2** in this section. We utilize Task-Agnostic Prefix Prompting (Ye et al., 2024), which enables the model to generate a reasoning process for a task based on parameterized knowledge. As illustrated in Figure 4, this method uses examples unrelated to the testing task to guide the model in producing reasoning processes and answers through context-based learning. Notably, the generated rationale relies on parameterized knowledge rather than knowledge acquired from context. This approach simply adds prefixes to the original instructions, making the detected knowl-




Figure 5: Performance of the ‘forgetting’ model using Direct Instruction Prompting (Ins) versus Task-Agnostic Prefix Prompting (TAP). *BF* refers to *Before Forgetting* and *AF* to *After Forgetting*.

edge more closely resemble the original ‘forgotten knowledge’ in QA format, rather than adopting other formats (Jiang et al., 2024). This similarity highlights that the knowledge itself is intact, and the challenge lies in the differences in “guidance” methods for generating an “appropriate rationale.”

Results and Analysis Results are presented in Figure 5. Adding an appropriate prefix to the original instruction enables the model to generate an appropriate rationale and recover its performance on forgotten tasks. Specifically, for different forgetting models, a Task-Agnostic Prefix added before the original instructions partially restores performance across various forgotten tasks. For optimal prefix selection, we employed a grid search to identify the best demonstrations and demonstration count for each task, highlighting the dependency of task recovery on prefix design. We hypothesize that an optimal Task-Agnostic Prefix can restore performance to pre-forgetting levels. Notably, larger models, such as Llama2-13B, exhibit higher recovery levels than smaller models like Llama2-7B and Mistral-7B, suggesting that model size correlates with resistance to “forgetting”.

Summary Experimental results indicate that the performance drop on previous tasks is primarily attributable to limitations in the prompting method. The model has not truly forgotten task-specific knowledge; rather, the prompts fail to effectively guide the generation of the appropriate rationale, giving the impression of forgotten knowledge.

4 Replay Based on Rationale-Guidance Difficulty

While it is possible to recover the performance of a forgotten model using appropriate prompts,

this approach is less cost-effective. Building on our assumption, we argue that replay-based algorithms (Wang et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2021) provide the most straightforward and efficient solution to mitigate catastrophic forgetting. In this section, we first introduce an evaluation metric, Rationale-Guidance Difficulty, to assess the difficulty of guiding a model toward an ‘appropriate rationale’ for a given instruction. Based on this metric, we dynamically allocate replay data for each previous task to optimize data utilization.

4.1 Rationale-Guidance Difficulty

The Rationale-Guidance Difficulty (RGD) score for a given data pair (x, r, y) is calculated as follows:

$$\text{RGD}_\theta(x, r, y) = \frac{\text{PPL}_\theta(r|x)}{\text{PPL}_\theta(r)} \quad (1)$$

Here, x denotes the prompt, r represents the inference process, y is the answer, and θ refers to the parameters of the model being tested. $\text{PPL}_\theta(r)$ reflects the difficulty for the model to generate the rationale r independently, while $\text{PPL}_\theta(r|x)$ measures the difficulty when generating r given the prompt x . The RGD score indicates how well a given prompt x facilitates the generation of rationale r . A higher RGD score signifies greater difficulty for a prompt in guiding the model to produce the rationale, and vice versa. The calculation method of this metric follows the Instruction Following Difficulty (IFD) score proposed by Li et al. (2024b), though the IFD score was primarily used for fine-tuning data selection (Li et al., 2024a,b).

For a given previous task t , we estimate its RGD score using a set of test data V :

$$\text{RGD}_\theta^t = \text{Mean}(\text{RGD}_V) \quad (2)$$

Mean(RGD_V) represents the mean and variance of the RGD score on the test dataset V .

4.2 Understanding Forgetting via Rationale-Guidance Difficulty

Forget	mean	std	Acc
False	39.77	13.67	78.40
True	45.71	38.75	60.00

Table 1: $\text{RGD}_\theta(x, r, y)$ scores (scaled by $1e-4$) comparison for the QQP task on Mistral-7B with and without forgetting.

Table 1 shows the RGD scores for the Mistral-7B model on the QQP task, before and after forgetting. Before forgetting, the model exhibits lower RGD scores, indicating that the instructions for the QQP task easily guide the model to the relevant knowledge, resulting in better performance. However, after forgetting, the RGD scores increase, suggesting that the instructions become less effective at guiding the model to the relevant knowledge, leading to a decline in task performance.

4.3 Dynamic Replay Strategy

Wang et al. (2024) propose determining the proportion of replay data based on task similarity, suggesting that tasks with greater differences from the current learning task should have more replay data. In contrast, we argue that the model’s capacity to learn and execute tasks is crucial, making it more reasonable to allocate replay data based on the model’s difficulty in generating rationales from prior instructions.

When training the model on the current task T_i , the amount of replay data required for the previous task T_j calculated as follows:

$$\alpha_j^* = \frac{\text{RGD}_{\theta_{i-1}}^j}{\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \text{RGD}_{\theta_{i-1}}^k} \times \alpha, \quad j \in [1, i-1] \quad (3)$$

where $\text{RGD}_{\theta_{i-1}}^j$ represents the rationale-guidance difficulty of task j after the model has completed training on task $i-1$, and α represents the total amount of replay data.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experiments Setup

5.1.1 Datasets

Long Sequence Benchmark (Razdaibiedina et al., 2023) A continual learning benchmark of

15 classification datasets. Following (Razdaibiedina et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b), we select 1,000 random samples for training each task and hold out 500 samples per class for validation and testing.

We employed Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct¹ to generate a rationale r for each data point (x, y) , ensuring that the initial part of the rationale did not directly reveal the final answer. Following prior work (Zhao et al., 2024), we employ two different training orders in our experiment.

5.1.2 Models

We utilize Qwen2 (0.5B, 1.5B) (Yang et al., 2024), Llama2 (7B, 13B) (Touvron et al., 2023b), and Mistral (7B) (Jiang et al., 2023) as the backbone models for our experiments.

5.1.3 Baselines

We primarily evaluate various data allocation methods for replay. For comparison, we use the following baseline allocation methods, employing random sampling to select replay samples for each task.

Equal Allocation (EA) For each previous task, we replay the same amount of samples while learning a new task to maintain the previous capability.

InsCL InsCL (Wang et al., 2024) dynamically replays previous data based on task similarity, calculated by Wasserstein Distance with instructions.

Multi-task Learning We use multi-task learning as the upper bound for continual learning.

5.1.4 Metrics

According to previous works (Zhang et al., 2023b; Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017; Biesialska et al., 2020), we use the following CL-related metrics that concentrate on catastrophic forgetting (stability) and knowledge transfer (plasticity). Let $a_{i,j}$ be the testing performance (Accuracy for classification task and Rouge-L for others) on the j -th task after training on i -th task, the metrics for evaluating are:

Final Average Performance (FAP) The average performance of all tasks after the final task t_T is learned, i.e., $\text{FAP}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{T,t}$;

Forgetting Rate (F.Ra) It measures how much knowledge has been forgotten across the first $T-1$ tasks, i.e., $\text{F}_T = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} (\max_{k=i}^{T-1} a_{k,t} - a_{T,t})$;

¹<https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct>

Method	Allocate	Select	FAP \uparrow	F.Ra \downarrow	BWT \uparrow	FWT \uparrow	CAP \uparrow
<i>Qwen2-0.5B</i>							
Single	-	-	72.64	-	-	-	72.64
Multi	-	-	76.32	-	-	-	76.32
CL	-	-	51.75	23.13	-22.98	0.33	72.97
EA	equal	random	71.78	3.40	-2.02	1.0	73.65
InsCL	instDiff	random	<u>74.06</u>	<u>1.55</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>1.27</u>	<u>73.91</u>
RGD	mean	random	74.69	0.59	0.67	1.43	74.07
<i>Llama2-7B</i>							
Single	-	-	77.62	-	-	-	77.62
Multi	-	-	80.57	-	-	-	80.57
CL	-	-	66.50	14.91	-14.79	2.54	80.16
EA	equal	random	78.59	2.62	-1.77	2.60	80.22
InsCL	instDiff	random	<u>80.56</u>	<u>0.90</u>	<u>0.94</u>	2.06	79.69
RGD	mean	random	81.07	0.80	1.21	<u>2.33</u>	<u>79.95</u>
<i>Mistral-7B</i>							
Single	-	-	79.01	-	-	-	79.01
Multi	-	-	78.79	-	-	-	78.79
CL	-	-	69.09	10.73	-10.27	-0.33	78.68
EA	equal	random	76.01	3.58	-2.88	<u>-0.31</u>	78.69
InsCL	instDiff	random	<u>76.25</u>	<u>3.54</u>	<u>-1.86</u>	<u>-1.02</u>	77.97
RGD	mean	random	76.42	3.45	-1.85	-0.86	<u>78.14</u>
<i>Llama2-13B</i>							
Single	-	-	73.91	-	-	-	73.91
Multi	-	-	83.48	-	-	-	83.48
CL	-	-	70.27	13.02	-12.90	3.01	82.17
EA	equal	random	80.81	1.75	<u>-1.27</u>	<u>2.83</u>	<u>81.98</u>
InsCL	instDiff	random	81.86	1.09	-0.07	2.77	81.93
RGD	mean-std	random	<u>81.05</u>	1.75	-1.30	3.10	82.26

Table 2: Experiments of different models on Long Sequence Benchmark. The decoding strategy is greedy search. Our method effectively alleviates model forgetting and maintains better model plasticity simultaneously

Backward Transfer (BWT) BWT measures the impact that continually learning on subsequent tasks has on previous tasks, i.e., $BWT_T = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} (a_{T,t} - a_{t,t})$.

Forward Transfer (FWT) FWT measures how much knowledge from previous tasks transfers to a new task, i.e., $FWT_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (a_{t,t} - a_{0,t})$ where $a_{0,t}$ refers to the performance of training task t individually;

Current Average Performance (CAP) The average performance of all tasks in their respective training stage, i.e., $CAP_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T a_{t,t}$.

Better scores on FAP, F.Ra, and BWT indicate improved model stability, while better scores on FWT and CAP reflect enhanced model plasticity.

5.2 Results and Analysis

Table 2 presents a performance comparison of different replay data allocation methods on the Long Sequence benchmark. All results are averaged across two different task orders. Detailed results for each order and task within a specific order are provided in the Appendix.

The equal allocation method significantly reduces catastrophic forgetting compared to no data replay For example, with Qwen2-0.5B, random data replay improved task performance by 20.03 and reduced the forgetting rate by 19.73. Similarly, for Mistral-7B, task performance increased by 6.92 and the forgetting rate decreased by 7.15. These results support our hypothesis that model performance degradation is due to ineffective task instructions, not forgotten knowledge. Simple data replay, using a small amount of data, helps the model leverage old knowledge more effectively, alleviating catastrophic forgetting.

The model exhibits inherent resistance to forgetting, which improves with larger model sizes Specifically, larger models show lower forgetting rates during continual learning without data replay. For example, the forgetting rates for Llama2-13B and Qwen2-0.5B are 13.02 and 23.13, respectively.

Using a data allocation algorithm can further alleviate model forgetting Our model-based data allocation method, along with the InsCL method that allocates data based on similarity, both more

Test Instruction of MNLI	Based on the premise “The northerner took his cloak and hat from the small boy and a leather sack of coin from one of the men in the crowd.”, can we conclude the hypothesis “The northerner left his cloak and hat behind,” is true? OPTIONS:- yes - it is not possible to tell - no
Prediction BF stage on MNLI (NLI)	The text suggests that the northerner takes his belongings, i.e., his cloak and hat, with him. It also mentions a “small boy” who was able to take something from him so he may have taken his belt, which is another piece of clothing. So we know that this hypothesis cannot be true based on what has already been stated. [RESULT]no
Prediction BF stage on CB (NLI)	The passage states that the northerner took his cloak and hat, which means he was there before taking them. Therefore, this statement contradicts the hypothesis. So, “yes” would be our answer here.[RESULT]yes
Prediction BF stage on Yahoo (TC)	This question belongs to the topic of probability theory, so the answer is 0.[RESULT]0

Table 3: Cases of Knowledge Drift and Instruction Drift. **1.** *BF* refers to *Before Forgetting* and *AF* to *After Forgetting*. **2.** *NLI* means *Natural Language Inference* and *TC* indicates *Topic Classification*.

effectively mitigate catastrophic forgetting in models of varying sizes and knowledge sources during continual learning, resulting in better final model performance.

Our method effectively alleviates model forgetting and maintains better model plasticity simultaneously For model plasticity metrics, FWT and CAP, our method performs similarly to InsCL on Llama2-7B. However, on other models, our approach outperforms InsCL, suggesting that it offers a more effective balance between mitigating catastrophic forgetting and preserving model plasticity.

6 Discussion and Future Work

What does the rationale generated by a “pseudo-forgetting” model look like under the guidance of old instructions? As shown in Table 3, our preliminary observations suggest that the inappropriate rationales which we call this **Rationale Drift** generated by “pseudo-forgetting” models primarily fall into two categories:

- 1. Instruction Drift (Misalignment):** When there is a significant difference between old and new tasks (e.g., the old task is Natural Language Inference (NLI), the new task is Topic Classification (TC)), the reasoning process tends to completely rely on TC-relevant knowledge due to instruction misalignment, leading to incorrect results.
- 2. Knowledge Drift:** When old and new tasks are similar (e.g., both NLI but from different domains), the rationale remains related to NLI knowledge but is influenced by the new domain’s knowledge. This causes deviation from the appropriate reasoning path, resulting in errors.

Additionally, **can these types of drift be detected by specific methods?** For instance, could differences in model hidden layer representations reveal their presence? Is there a big difference between the Rationale-Guidance Difficulty in the two cases?

More Complex Scenarios Current continual learning benchmarks rely on traditional NLP tasks, which may be relatively simple and thus less likely to induce forgetting in the model. To enhance the credibility of our conclusions, more complex domain adaptation datasets, such as TRACE (Wang et al., 2023c), could be utilized to replicate the experiments.

Design of Continual Learning Algorithm Our study assumes that the model retains prior knowledge during continual learning and inherently resists forgetting, making simple data replay effective in mitigating catastrophic forgetting. Another key goal of continual learning is to maximize asynchronous knowledge transfer across tasks to enhance model performance. Given that prior knowledge is parameterized, we propose that a combined approach, integrating both parametric and data replay perspectives, may be the most effective.

7 Conclusion

This study sheds light on the intrinsic mechanism behind catastrophic forgetting in continual learning, revealing that task knowledge is not truly lost but hindered by inadequate instruction guidance for appropriate rationales. We validate this hypothesis within LLMs and with consistent knowledge expression by subjecting the forgetting model to passive external knowledge guidance and incorporating a task-agnostic prefix into the original instruction for an active generation, both of which

effectively recover the performance of the forgetting model. We introduce a Rationale-Guidance Difficulty, which evaluates the difficulty of guiding the model to generate appropriate rationales—a critical factor in overcoming forgetting. Using this metric, our proposed replay data allocation method effectively mitigates forgetting while maintaining model plasticity.

References

- Rahaf Aljundi, Francesca Babiloni, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Marcus Rohrbach, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2018. [Memory aware synapses: Learning what \(not\) to forget](#). In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference, Munich, Germany, September 8-14, 2018, Proceedings, Part III*, volume 11207 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 144–161. Springer.
- Magdalena Biesialska, Katarzyna Biesialska, and Marta R Costa-Jussa. 2020. Continual lifelong learning in natural language processing: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09823*.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.14165.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, Mehdi Mirza, Xia Da, Aaron C. Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. [An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks](#). In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Jiafeng Guo, Changjiang Zhou, Ruqing Zhang, Jiangui Chen, Maarten de Rijke, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. [Corpusbrain++: A continual generative pre-training framework for knowledge-intensive language tasks](#). *CoRR*, abs/2402.16767.
- Yusong Hu, De Cheng, Dingwen Zhang, Nannan Wang, Tongliang Liu, and Xinbo Gao. 2024. [Task-aware orthogonal sparse network for exploring shared knowledge in continual learning](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Jianheng Huang, Leyang Cui, Ante Wang, Chengyi Yang, Xinting Liao, Linfeng Song, Junfeng Yao, and Jinsong Su. 2024. [Mitigating catastrophic forgetting in large language models with self-synthesized rehearsal](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 1416–1428. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yufan Huang, Yanzhe Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Xuezhi Wang, and Diyi Yang. 2021. [Continual learning for text classification with information disentanglement based regularization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 2736–2746. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Gangwei Jiang, Caigao Jiang, Zhaoyi Li, Siqiao Xue, Jun Zhou, Linqi Song, Defu Lian, and Ying Wei. 2024. [Interpretable catastrophic forgetting of large language model fine-tuning via instruction vector](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.12227.
- Suhas Kotha, Jacob Mitchell Springer, and Aditi Raghunathan. 2024. [Understanding catastrophic forgetting in language models via implicit inference](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Ming Li, Yong Zhang, Shwai He, Zhitao Li, Hongyu Zhao, Jianzong Wang, Ning Cheng, and Tianyi Zhou. 2024a. [Superfiltering: Weak-to-strong data filtering for fast instruction-tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 14255–14273. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ming Li, Yong Zhang, Zhitao Li, Jiuhai Chen, Lichang Chen, Ning Cheng, Jianzong Wang, Tianyi Zhou, and Jing Xiao. 2024b. [From quantity to quality: Boosting LLM performance with self-guided data selection for instruction tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), NAACL 2024, Mexico City, Mexico, June 16-21, 2024*, pages 7602–7635. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qingbin Liu, Pengfei Cao, Cao Liu, Jiansong Chen, Xunliang Cai, Fan Yang, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2021. [Domain-lifelong learning for dialogue state tracking via knowledge preservation networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*,

- EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pages 2301–2311. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Lopez-Paz and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2017. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J. Cohen. 1989. **Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem**. volume 24 of *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, pages 109–165. Academic Press.
- Chengwei Qin and Shafiq R. Joty. 2022. **LFPT5: A unified framework for lifelong few-shot language learning based on prompt tuning of T5**. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Yuning Mao, Rui Hou, Madian Khabisa, Mike Lewis, and Amjad Almahairi. 2023. Progressive prompts: Continual learning for language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabisa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023a. **Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. **Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Xiao Wang, Tianze Chen, Qiming Ge, Han Xia, Rong Bao, Rui Zheng, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023a. **Orthogonal subspace learning for language model continual learning**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 10658–10671. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiao Wang, Tianze Chen, Qiming Ge, Han Xia, Rong Bao, Rui Zheng, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023b. **Orthogonal subspace learning for language model continual learning**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 10658–10671. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiao Wang, Yuansen Zhang, Tianze Chen, Songyang Gao, Senjie Jin, Xianjun Yang, Zhiheng Xi, Rui Zheng, Yicheng Zou, Tao Gui, et al. 2023c. **Trace: A comprehensive benchmark for continual learning in large language models**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06762*.
- Yifan Wang, Yafei Liu, Chufan Shi, Haoling Li, Chen Chen, Haonan Lu, and Yujiu Yang. 2024. **Inscl: A data-efficient continual learning paradigm for fine-tuning large language models with instructions**. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), NAACL 2024, Mexico City, Mexico, June 16-21, 2024*, pages 663–677. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024. **Qwen2 technical report**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.
- Yizhe Yang, Huashan Sun, Jiawei Li, Runheng Liu, Yinghao Li, Yuhang Liu, Heyan Huang, and Yang Gao. 2023. **Mindllm: Pre-training lightweight large language model from scratch, evaluations and domain applications**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.15777.
- Seonghyeon Ye, Hyeonbin Hwang, Sohee Yang, Hyeonung Yun, Yireun Kim, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. **Investigating the effectiveness of task-agnostic prefix prompt for instruction following**. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 19386–19394. AAAI Press.
- Duzhen Zhang, Wei Cong, Jiahua Dong, Yahan Yu, Xiuyi Chen, Yonggang Zhang, and Zhen Fang. 2023a. **Continual named entity recognition without catastrophic forgetting**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 8186–8197. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, Ling Chen, and Mohammad-Reza Namazi-Rad. 2023b. **CITB: A benchmark for continual instruction tuning**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 9443–9455. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weixiang Zhao, Shilong Wang, Yulin Hu, Yanyan Zhao, Bing Qin, Xuanyu Zhang, Qing Yang, Dongliang

- Xu, and Wanxiang Che. 2024. [SAPT: A shared attention framework for parameter-efficient continual learning of large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024, pages 11641–11661. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yingxiu Zhao, Yinhe Zheng, Zhiliang Tian, Chang Gao, Jian Sun, and Nevin L. Zhang. 2022. [Prompt conditioned VAE: enhancing generative replay for lifelong learning in task-oriented dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, pages 11153–11169. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junhao Zheng, Shengjie Qiu, Chengming Shi, and Qianli Ma. 2024. [Towards lifelong learning of large language models: A survey](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.06391.
- Fan Zhou and Chengtai Cao. 2021. [Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in graph neural networks with experience replay](#). In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 4714–4722. AAAI Press.